

# PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the  
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

## PCT

### WRITTEN OPINION

(PCT Rule 66)

To:

CALDWELL, Stacey E.  
MOLEX INCORPORATED  
2222 Wellington Court  
Lisle, IL 60532  
ETATS-UNIS D'AMERIQUE

DEC 22 2004

Date of mailing  
(day/month/year)

17.12.2004

Applicant's or agent's file reference  
A3-158PCT

**REPLY DUE**

**within 1 month(s)**  
from the above date of mailing

International application No.  
PCT/US 03/1881

International filing date (day/month/year)  
08.10.2003

Priority date (day/month/year)  
25.10.2002

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC  
H01R31/06

Applicant  
MOLEX INCORPORATED et al.

1. This written opinion is the **second** drawn up by this International Preliminary Examining Authority.

2. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- I ☒ Basis of the opinion
- II ☐ Priority
- III ☐ Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- IV ☐ Lack of unity of invention
- V ☒ Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- VI ☐ Certain documents cited
- VII ☐ Certain defects in the international application
- VIII ☐ Certain observations on the international application

3. The applicant is hereby **invited to reply** to this opinion.

**When?** See the time limit indicated above. The applicant may, before the expiration of that time limit, request this Authority to grant an extension, see Rule 66.2(d).

**How?** By submitting a written reply, accompanied, where appropriate, by amendments, according to Rule 66.3. For the form and the language of the amendments, see Rules 66.8 and 66.9.

**Also:** For an additional opportunity to submit amendments, see Rule 66.4.  
For the examiner's obligation to consider amendments and/or arguments, see Rule 66.4 bis.  
For an informal communication with the examiner, see Rule 66.6.

**If no reply is filed**, the international preliminary examination report will be established on the basis of this opinion.

4. The final date by which the international preliminary examination report must be established according to Rule 69.2 is: 25.02.2005

DOCKET

Case No. : A3-158 PCT

Serial No. :

Name and mailing address of the international preliminary examining authority:



European Patent Office  
D-80298 Munich  
Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d  
Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Authorized Officer

Chelbosu, L

Formalities officer (incl. extension of time limits)

Pinna, A

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-7955



**I. Basis of the opinion**

1. With regard to the **elements** of the international application (*Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this opinion as "originally filed"*):

**Description, Pages**

1-7 as originally filed

**Claims, Numbers**

1-5 filed with telefax on 26.04.2004

**Drawings, Sheets**

1/12-12/12 as originally filed

2. With regard to the **language**, all the elements marked above were available or furnished to this Authority in the language in which the international application was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

These elements were available or furnished to this Authority in the following language: , which is:

- ☐ the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of the international search (under Rule 23.1(b)).
- ☐ the language of publication of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)).
- ☐ the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination (under Rule 55.2 and/or 55.3).

3. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application, the international preliminary examination was carried out on the basis of the sequence listing:

- ☐ contained in the international application in written form.
- ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in written form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in computer readable form.
- ☐ The statement that the subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed has been furnished.
- ☐ The statement that the information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the written sequence listing has been furnished.

4. The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

- ☐ the description, pages:
- ☐ the claims, Nos.:
- ☐ the drawings, sheets:

5. ☐ This opinion has been established as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed (Rule 70.2(c)).

6. Additional observations, if necessary:

**V. Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement****1. Statement**

Novelty (N)	Claims	
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	1,2,3,4
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	

**2. Citations and explanations****see separate sheet**

**Re Item V**

**Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) PCT with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement.**

**1. STATE OF THE ART**

Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: EP-A-0 939 582 (JAPAN SOLDERLESS TERMINAL) 1 September 1999

D2: US-A-5 752 857 (A.J.KNIGHTS) 19 May 1998

**2. LACK OF INVENTIVE STEP**

The present application does not meet the requirements of Article 33(3) PCT because the subject-matter of the claim 1 is not inventive. The reasons are the following:

Document D1, which is considered to represent the most relevant state of the art, discloses an adapter connector for a memory card connector to enable a miniature memory card to be inserted into a larger, standard memory card connector (see paragraph 37 in D1) from which the subject-matter of claim 1 differs in that:

F1: each terminal includes a first contact portion at one end thereof for engaging a appropriate contact on the standard memory card connector, a second contact portion at an opposite end thereof for engaging an appropriate contact of the miniature memory card and a mounting section between said opposite ends.

Adapter for making a connection between a standard memory card connector and a miniature memory card, said adapter having terminals without a circuit board between end contact parts, namely a plurality of one-piece terminals, represents for the person skilled in the art only an obvious constructive alternative (see, for example D2, col. 5, lines 19-41). Therefore, including F1 in D1 would not represent an inventive step.

#### **4. DEPENDENT CLAIMS**

4.1 Dependent claims 2-4 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of inventive step, the reasons being as follows:

- inner housing, integrally welded to the base housing is disclosed in D2 as an alternative of a housing made of two independent parts (see in D2 figures 6A and 6) and therefore, claim 2 is not inventive;
- a reinforcing plate supporting the base housing is disclosed in D1 (see fig. 4A, reference 56 which holds the two bars of the base housing/frame) and therefore claim 3 is not inventive;
- the additional features of claim 4 are also disclosed in D1 (see in fig. 4A the elongated inner housing having the reference sign 2 and the reinforcing plate 56 having a narrow band running parallel to said inner housing).

4.2 The additional features of dependent claim 5 are neither known from, nor rendered obvious by, the documents cited in the International Search Report.

#### **4. MISCELLANEOUS**

When a new set of claims will be drafted, it is suggested to bear in mind that:

- the independent claim should be drafted the two-part form in accordance with Rule 6.3(b) PCT, with those features known in combination from D1 being placed in the preamble [Rule 6.3(b)(I) PCT] and with the remaining features being included in the characterising part [Rule 6.3(b)(ii)PCT];
- the description should indicate D1, D2 as documents reflecting the prior art [Rule 5.1(a)(ii) PCT];
- the description should be amended in order to disclose the invention as claimed [Rule 5.1(a)(iii) PCT].